arXiv:1606.00389v1 [stat.ML] 1 Jun 2016

Stream Clipper: Scalable Submodular Maximization on Stream

Tianyi Zhou[†], Jeff Bilmes[‡]

[†]Computer Science & Engineering, [‡]Electrical Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle
{tianyizh, bilmes}@uw.edu

Abstract

Applying submodular maximization in the streaming setting is nontrivial because the commonly used greedy algorithm exceeds the fixed memory and computational limits typically needed during stream processing. We introduce a new algorithm, called stream clipper, that uses two thresholds to select elements either into a solution set S or an extra buffer B. The output is achieved by a greedy algorithm that starts from S and then, if needed, greedily adds elements from B. Swapping elements out of S may also be triggered lazily for further improvements, and elements may also be removed from B (and corresponding thresholds adjusted) in order to keep memory use bounded by a constant. Although the worst-case approximation factor does not outperform the previous worst-case of $1/2$, stream clipper can perform better than $1/2$ depending on the order of the elements in the stream. We develop the idea of an "order complexity" to characterize orders on which an approximation factor of $1-\alpha$ can be achieved. In news and video summarization tasks, stream clipper significantly outperforms other streaming methods. It shows similar performance to the greedy algorithm but with less computation and memory costs.

1 Introduction

Success in today's machine learning and artificial intelligence algorithms relies largely on big data. Often, however, there may exist a small subset of data that can accurately act as a surrogate for the whole. Thus, various summarization methods have been designed to select such representative subsets. They are usually formulated as maximizing a score function $f(S)$ that assigns importance scores to subsets $S \subseteq V$, where V is a ground set containing all elements. Submodular functions are a useful class of functions to use for this purpose: a function $f: 2^V \to \mathbb{R}$ is subsmodular [7] if for any subset $A \subseteq B \subseteq V$ and $v \notin B$ we have,

$$f(v \cup A) - f(A) \geq f(v \cup B) - f(B). \tag{1}$$

Submodular functions have been used as objectives in summarization and machine learning applications since the above diminishing returns property captures interactions amongst elements comensurate to the importance of their contributions to a summary. The importance v's contribution to A is $f(v|A) \triangleq f(v \cup A) - f(A)$, which is called the "marginal gain" of v conditioned on A.

The objective $f(\cdot)$ can be chosen from a rich class of submodular functions, e.g., facility location, saturated coverage, feature based, entropy and $\log\det(\cdot)$. We focus on the most commonly used polymatroid functions that are monotone non-decreasing and normalized, i.e., $f(v|A) > 0, \forall v \in V \backslash A, A \subseteq V$ and $f(\emptyset) = 0$. In order to make a summary S of reasonable size, cost effective, or obeying certain structure, a constraint is usually applied. We focus on a cardinality constraint, which limits a summary size, but we also address knapsack and matroid constraints as well in [1]. Under a cardinality constraint, the problem is

$$\max_{S \subseteq V, |S| \leq k} f(S). \tag{2}$$

Submodular maximization is usually NP-hard. However, (2) can be solved near-optimally by a greedy algorithm with approximation factor $1 - 1/e$ [16]. Starting from $S \leftarrow \emptyset$, greedy algorithm selects the element with the largest marginal gain $f(v|S)$ into S, i.e., $S \leftarrow S \cup \text{argmax}_{v \in V \backslash S} f(v|S)$,

until $|S| = k$. To accelerate the greedy algorithm without an objective value loss, the lazy greedy approach [11, 14] updates only the top element of a priority queue of marginal gains for all elements in $V \backslash S$ in each step. Recent approximate greedy algorithms [10, 15, 18] develop piece-wise, multi-stage, or random sampling strategies to gain a tradeoff between objective optimality and speed.

In a large number of applications such as news digesting, video thumbnailing, music recommending and photo sharing, however, data is fed into a system as a stream $(v_1, v_2, \ldots)$ and under a particular order. At any time point n, the user can request a summary of the n elements $v_{1:n} \triangleq \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ he/she has seen so far. The greedy algorithm and its variants are not appropriate to the streaming setting both for memory and computational reasons, i.e., they require storing all n elements, and compute their marginal gains per step. In this paper, we study how to solve (2) with $V = v_{1:n}$ for any n in the streaming setting after one pass of the first n elements by using a memory of size $b + k \ll n$. Since keeping all n elements in memory is not allowed, the objective $f(S)$ on output S and its lower bound $f(S) \geq (1 - \alpha) f(S^*)$ may vary with the order of the n elements in the stream. Here $S^* \in \operatorname{argmax}_{S \subseteq v_{1:n}, |S| \leq k} f(S)$. We further study how α varies with the order σ of $V = v_{1:n}$ in the stream, i.e., when the stream is $(v_{\sigma_1}, v_{\sigma_2}, \cdots, v_{\sigma_n})$.

1.1 Related Work

Three strategies have been proposed in previous work to solve (2) in the streaming setting. A thresholding algorithm in [2] adds element v to a summary S if its marginal gain $f(v|S)$ exceeds a threshold $\tau = \frac{f(S^*)/2 - f(S)}{k - |S|}$. One function evaluation is required per step for computing $f(v|S)$. However, $f(S^*)$ in τ is rarely known and thus a binary search is necessary. In practice, multiple instances of the algorithm with different estimates of $f(S^*)$ are applied to the same stream. The one achieving the largest $f(S)$ gives the final solution S. It has guarantee $f(S) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon\right) f(S^*)$ with $O(k \log k/\epsilon)$ memory, because it needs to try $O(\log k/\epsilon)$ estimates of $f(S^*)$ and cache the corresponding solutions.

Swapping between new elements and the ones in S is a natural yet more computationally expensive strategy [5, 6, 8]. The algorithm initializes S with the first k elements from the stream, and keeps replacing a new element v and $u \in S$ once $f(S \cup v \backslash u) \geq (1 + c/k) f(S)$ [5] or $f(v|S) \geq \alpha + (1 + \beta) f(u|S_u)$ [6], where c, α and β are nonnegative constants, and S_u denotes the S right before adding u to it. Both cases have guarantee $f(S) \geq \frac{1}{4} f(S^*)$ (when $c = 1$ for the former) with memory size k. The latter requires less computation, i.e, one function evaluation per element, comparing to k evaluations required by the former.

A mini-batch based strategy splits the whole stream evenly into k segments, and sequentially adds to S the element v with the largest marginal gain $f(v|S)$ in each segment. It was introduced via the submodular secretary problem and its extensions [3]. This algorithm has an approximation bound of $f(S) \geq \frac{1 - 1/e}{e} f(S^*)$ in expectation with memory size k, if the data arrive in a uniformly at random order. This method requires only one function evaluation per element. But it needs to know the length of stream n in advance and uniformly at random ordering of all elements, impossible when the stream is unboundedly large and a summary can be requested at any time.

A hardness result is given in Theorem 1.6 of [5]: for solving (2) in the online setting, there is no deterministic algorithm $1/2 + \epsilon$-competitive for any constant $\epsilon > 0$. In Lemma 4.7 of [5], the approximation factor in the worst case cannot exceed $1/2 + \epsilon$ unless $b \geq n - k$ and all the n elements up to a summary request can be stored in the memory.

1.2 Main Contribution

In practice, the thresholding algorithm needs to try a large number of estimates to $f(S^*)$ before achieving a sufficiently good solution, because the objective is sensitive to tiny changes in threshold τ, which depends on estimate to $f(S^*)$. This results in heavy memory load. Though swapping and mini-batch strategies ask for a smaller memory size k, the former requires k function evaluations per step, while the latter needs to know n in advance and requires uniformly random ordered elements, which cannot be justified in a streaming setting. Although the approximation factors of the three algorithms are $1/2$, $1/4$ and $(1 - 1/e)/e$ respectively, they perform much poorer than the offline greedy algorithm with an approximation factor $1 - 1/e$.



Figure 1: Left: Naïve stream clipper in Algorithm 1, $(v_1, v_2, \cdots, v_n)$ is the stream, $(v_{s_1}, v_{s_2}, \cdots, v_{s_m})$ is the sequence of the m selected elements; Right: Stream clipper with swapping and buffer clean in Algorithm 2, swapping replaces v_{s_1} with $v_{s'_1}$ and increase both τ^- and τ^+, buffer clean removes elements by increasing τ^-.



Figure 2: Order complexity of stream clipper.

The main contributions of this paper are twofold. Firstly, we propose a novel streaming algorithm "stream clipper" that can sometimes achieve the same competitive performance as the offline greedy algorithm in practice, and we analyze when this is the case. With stream clipper (left plot in Figure 1), two thresholds τ^- and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$ are used to process each element v: it adds v to the solution set S if $f(v|S) \geq \tau^+$; rejects v if $f(v|S) \leq \tau^-$; otherwise (i.e., $f(v|S) \in (\tau^-, \tau^+)$) places v in a buffer B. The output is generated by a greedy algorithm starting from the current S and adds more elements from B to S until S reaches the budget size k. The two-threshold scheme reduces the sensitiveness of a single thresholding method to changes in threshold, since the resultant buffer offers the elements whose marginal gains are slightly less than τ^+ a second chance to be selected into S. In an advanced version of the algorithm (right plot in Figure 1), for v assigned to the buffer in a naïve version, it replaces some element in S with v if the swapping improves the objective $f(S)$. This avoids extra computation spent on swapping for every element $v \in V$. The thresholds are adaptively adjusted and help to remove elements from the buffer once its size exceeds a user defined limit b.

Secondly, we develop the notion of "order complexity" to study how the approximation bound changes with the order of elements in the stream and the memory size. Although the approximation factor cannot exceed $1/2$ if memory size $b < n - k$ according to the hardness analysis in [5], a better bound can be achieved on a specific subset of orders. The order complexity characterizes the properties of these orders, and quantifies the number of them.

Definition 1. *For Algorithm 1 with given τ^- and τ^+, with memory size $b \in [1, n]$, the order complexity of stream clipper is defined as $\pi(\alpha) \triangleq |\Phi(\alpha)|/n!$ such that for any polymatroid function $f(\cdot)$ and any order $\sigma \in \Phi(\alpha)$, stream clipper has approximation bound $f(S) \geq (1-\alpha)f(S^*)$.*



Figure 3: Order complexity in general.

Our analysis of the order complexity of stream clipper is based on its approximation bound in different cases. Figure 2 illustrates the basic idea: when α is small, the $1-\alpha$ bound can be only achieved on a small portion of orders $\Phi(\alpha)$, so $\pi(\alpha)$ is small; however, if the memory size increases, the $1-\alpha$ bound can be achieved on a larger portion of orders and thus $\pi(\alpha)$ increases. The contour curves of $\pi(\alpha)$ for different α reflects tradeoffs between the approximation bound, memory, and order complexity.

We also consider a more general order complexity notion, one that is algorithm independent, and can provide a hardness result for all streaming submodular maximization algorithms.

Definition 2. *If the memory size is $b \in [1, n]$, the general order complexity is $\pi(\alpha) \triangleq |\Phi(\alpha)|/n!$ such that there exists a polymatroid function $f(\cdot)$ and an order $\sigma \in \bar{\Phi}(\alpha)$, so that a polynomial time algorithm with approximation bound $f(S) \geq (1-\alpha)f(S^*)$ does not exist unless **P=NP**.*

Here $\bar{\Phi}(\alpha)$ is the complement of $\Phi(\alpha)$. Figure 3 illustrates the basic idea. The top horizontal line associated with $\alpha = 0.5$ reflects the $1/2$ hardness result in [5] for algorithms with memory size $b < n - k$. When $b = n$, the best approximation bound that can be achieved is $1 - 1/e$ provided

by greedy algorithm. The other areas and the dashed curves in the plot are unknown and will be explored in the future.

In Section 3, experiments on news and video summarization show that stream clipper significantly outperforms other streaming algorithms consistently (Figure 4-7, Figure 11). In most experiments, it achieves $f(S)$ as large as the offline greedy algorithm, and produces a summary of similar quality, but costs much less memory and computation.

2 Stream Clipper

In the following, we firstly introduce naïve stream clipper and then later its advanced version with swapping and buffer cleaning procedures. Detailed analysis of the approximation bound and order complexity for the naïve version follows. We further show the analysis can be extended to the advanced version.

2.1 Naïve Stream Clipper

For simplicity and clarity, we first study a naïve version of stream clipper in Algorithm 1. It selects element v if $f(v|S) \geq \tau^+$ and $|S| < k$, and stores $f(v|S)$ in $s(v)$ (A1.L2-3[1]), while rejects v if $f(v|S) \leq \tau^-$ (A1.L7). It places v whose marginal gain is between τ^- and τ^+ (A1.L4) into the buffer B (A1.L5). Once a summary is requested, a greedy algorithm (A1.L8-10) adds more elements from B to S until $|S| = k$. In the following, we use S_i and B_i to represent S and B at the end of the i^{th} iteration in Algorithm 1. Note S_n and B_n are the solution S and buffer B after passing n elements but before running greedy algorithm in A1.L8-10. We use S_{sc} to represent the output solution of Algorithm 1. Assume $|S_n| = m$, v_{s_i} for $i \in [m]$ denotes the i^{th} selected element by A1.L3.

Algorithm 1: `naïve_stream_clipper`

Input : $(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)$, k, τ^-, τ^+
Output : S
Initialize : $S \leftarrow \emptyset$, $B \leftarrow \emptyset$

1 **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** n **do**
2 **if** $f(v_i|S) \geq \tau^+$ *and* $|S| < k$ **then**
3 $S \leftarrow S \cup v_i$
4 **else if** $f(v_i|S) > \tau^-$ **then**
5 $B \leftarrow B \cup v_i$
6 **else**
7 Reject v_i
8 **while** $|S| < k$ **do**
9 $v^* = \text{argmax}_{v \in B} f(v|S)$
10 $S \leftarrow S \cup v^*$, $B \leftarrow B \backslash v^*$

2.2 Advanced Stream Clipper

In practice, two additional strategies are developed to (1) achieve further improvement by swapping but at a cost less than previous swapping methods [5], and (2) we limit the buffer size $|B| \leq b$ by removing elements from B. The variant of stream clipper after applying these two strategies is given in Algorithm 2 [1], where A2.L5-10 delineate the first strategy, and A2.L15-17 delineate the second strategy. Note Algorithm 2 is reduced to Algorithm 1 after removing these lines.

Swapping procedure is given in A2.L5-10. A2.L5 seeks for the element $u \in S$ such that replacing u by v leads to the maximal objective $f(S \backslash u \cup v)$. A2.L6 computes ρ, the average of the improvement on the objective over all $|S|$ elements in S. If $\rho > 0$, which means swapping brings positive improvements to the objective, the swapping is accepted as in A2.L10. Instead of testing swapping (i.e., applying A2.L5) on every element from the stream as previous swapping methods [5], stream clipper only computes A2.L5 for v_i such that $f(v_i|S) \in (\tau^-, \tau^+)$. This improves the efficiency since $A2.L5$ requires $|S|$ function evaluations.

When the buffer size reaches the user defined limit b, stream clipper increases τ^- by step size $\Delta\tau$ as shown in A2.L16. Since the lower threshold τ^- increases, elements in buffer B whose marginal gain $f(v|S) \leq \tau^-$ can be removed from B (A2.L17). Note the maximal value of τ^- after increasing is τ^+, because $|B| = 0$ when $\tau^- = \tau^+$. This procedure repeats until $|B| < b$.

In Algorithm 2, parameter $\hat{f}(S^*)$ is an estimate to $f(S^*)$. In practice, it can be set as $f(v_1)$ in the beginning and adaptively increased to $f(S)$ in later steps. The positive "step size" $\Delta\tau$ is initialized as $\hat{f}(S^*)/20k$ since it works well empirically. The two thresholds are initialized so τ^- is sufficiently small to guarantee $|B_n| \geq k - |S_n|$ and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$.

[1] We use A for Alogrithm and L for line. For example, A1.L2-5 refers to Line 2-5 of Algorithm 1

2.3 Approximation Bound

We study the approximation bound of Algorithm 1 that depend on τ^- and τ^+. Firstly, we assume τ^- is properly selected so $|B_n| \geq k - |S_n|$, which guarantees $k - |S_n|$ elements are selected by the greedy algorithm in A1.L8-10 and thus $|S| = n$ on the final output.

Lemma 1. *If $\tau^- = 0$ and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$, then $|B_n| \geq k - |S_n|$ before A1.L8.*

In this trivial case, all the elements whose marginal gain is less than τ^+ will be stored in buffer, and may lead to a large B_n. However, the advanced version Algorithm 2 can start from a small τ^-, and adaptively increase it and clean the buffer when $|B|$ exceeds the limit b. By following similar proof technique in [16], we have the theorem below. Please refer to [1] for detailed proofs.

Theorem 1. *If submodular function $f(\cdot)$ is monotone non-decreasing and normalized, $k_n = |(S^* \backslash S_n) \backslash B_n|$, the following result holds for the final output S of Algorithm 1.*

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}}\right)\left(f(S^*) - k_n\tau^-\right) + e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}}|S_n|\tau^+, \tag{3}$$

The bound in (3) is a convex combination of $f(S^*) - k_n\tau^-$ and $|S_n|\tau^+$. It depends on k_n, the number of elements in optimal set S^* that have been rejected by A1.L7. However, k_n cannot be known without knowing S^*, S_n and B_n . In order to remove the dependency on k_n, we take the minimum of (3) over all possible values of $k_n \in [0, k]$. Since the bound in (3) also depends on $|S_n|$, τ^- and τ^+ and, it turns out that the minimum w.r.t k_n is different when $f(S^*)$ is in three possible ranges defined by τ^- and τ^+.

Theorem 2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, the lower bound of $f(S)$ is different in the three possible ranges of $f(S^*)$.*

When $f(S^*) \leq k_n\tau^- + |S_n|\tau^+$ (Case 1),

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq |S_n|\tau^+ \geq \frac{|S_n|}{k} \times \frac{f(S^*)}{2}. \tag{4}$$

When $k_n\tau^- + |S_n|\tau^+ < f(S^*) < e^{1-\frac{|S_n|}{k}}k\tau^- + |S_n|\tau^+$ (Case 2),

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq f(S^*) - k\tau^-. \tag{5}$$

When $f(S^*) \geq e^{1-\frac{|S_n|}{k}}k\tau^- + |S_n|\tau^+$ (Case 3),

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq \left(1 - e^{-1+\frac{|S_n|}{k}}\right) f(S^*) + e^{-1+\frac{|S_n|}{k}}|S_n|\tau^+. \tag{6}$$

Corollary 1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, when $f(S^*) \leq k_n\tau^- + |S_n|\tau^+$ (case 1), if $\tau^- \leq \frac{f(S^*)}{2k_n}$ and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$ [2], $f(S_{sc}) \geq f(S^*)/2$. When $f(S^*) > k_n\tau^- + |S_n|\tau^+$ (case 2&3), if $|S_n| = 0$, $f(S_{sc}) \geq \left(1 - e^{-1}\right) f(S^*)$.*

According to Corollary 1, although the approximation factor is possible to be $1 - 1/e$, the worst case bound is still $f(S^*)/2$. This obeys the $1/2$ hardness given in [5], i.e., it is impossible to improve the worst-case bound over $f(S^*)/2$. However, the bound can be strictly better than $f(S^*)/2$ on specific orders of the same set of elements $v_{1:n}$. By studying the following proposed order complexity, we can quantify the proportion of these specific orders.

2.4 Order Complexity

Fixing the input of Algorithm 1, i.e., given the set of elements $V = v_{1:n}$, the budget size k, and the two thresholds τ^- and τ^+, the bounds for Case 1 (4) and Case 3 (6) varies with $|S_n|$, which depends on the order of $v_{1:n}$ in the stream. The bound for Case 2 (5) is order independent, but the condition depends on $|S_n|$.

In the following analysis, we use $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \cdots, \sigma_n)$, a sequence of n distinct integers from 1 to n, to denote the order of elements $v_{1:n}$ in the stream, i.e., $(v_{\sigma_1}, v_{\sigma_2}, \cdots, v_{\sigma_n})$. We use Σ to represent the set of all $n!$ orders. By analyzing the three cases in Theorem 2, we can locate τ^- and τ^+ in specific ranges. In each range, we characterize the orders on which $f(S_{sc}) \geq (1 - \alpha)f(S^*)$ and buffer size is bounded by b, i.e., $|B_i| \leq b \; \forall i \in [n]$.

[2] When $\tau^- = \tau^+ = f(S^*)/(2k)$, it reduces to single thresholding algorithm.

Proposition 1. *1) When $\alpha \in [0, 1/e]$, given τ^- and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$, define*

$$m^* \triangleq \min \left\{ m \in [n] : \tau^+ \geq \frac{(1 - e^{1-m/k}\alpha) f(S^*)}{m}, \tau^- \leq \frac{f(S^*) - m\tau^+}{e^{1-m/k}k} \right\}, \tag{7}$$

for any order

$$\sigma \in \{\sigma \in \Sigma : |S_n| \geq m^*, |B_n| \leq b\}, \tag{8}$$

we have $f(S_{sc}) \geq (1 - \alpha) f(S^*)$.

2) When $\alpha \in (1/e, 1/2]$, given τ^- and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$, define

$$M_1 \triangleq \left\{ m \in [n] : \frac{(1-\alpha) f(S^*)}{k} \leq \tau^+ \leq \frac{f(S^*)}{m+k} \right\}, M_2 \triangleq \left\{ m \in [n] : \tau^- \leq \frac{f(S^*) - m\tau^+}{e^{1-m/k}k} \right\}, \tag{9}$$

and

$$M \triangleq \left\{ m \in [n] : \frac{f(S^*) - e^{1-\frac{m}{k}} k\tau^-}{m} < \tau^+ < \frac{f(S^*) - k\tau^-}{m}, \tau^- \leq \frac{\alpha f(S^*)}{k} \right\} \tag{10}$$

for any order

$$\sigma \in \bigcup_{m \in (M_1 \cap M_2) \cup M} \{\sigma \in \Sigma : |S_n| = m, |B_n| \leq b\}, \tag{11}$$

we have $f(S_{sc}) \geq (1 - \alpha) f(S^*)$.

The detailed proof is given in [1]. According to Proposition 1, given τ^- and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$, finding the orders on which $f(S_{sc}) \geq (1 - \alpha) f(S^*)$ equals to finding the orders on which stream clipper achieves 1) $|S_n| \geq m^*$ and $|B_n| \leq b$ if $\alpha \in [0, 1/e]$, or 2) $|S_n| = m$ and $|B_n| \leq b$ for every $m \in (M_1 \cap M_2) \cup M$ if $\alpha \in (1/e, 1/2]$. For simplicity, we denote $\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j$ with $x_{1:i-1}$. The number of m-permutations and m-combinations of n are respectively denoted by P_n^m and C_n^m.

Lemma 2. *On an order $\sigma \in \Sigma$ of $v_{1:n}$, Algorithm 1 achieves $|S_n| \geq m$ and $|B_n| \leq b$ if there exists an subsequence of integers $s_0 \triangleq 0 < s_1 < s_2 < \cdots < s_m < s_{m+1} \triangleq n + 1$ such that*

$$f(v_{\sigma_{s_i}}) \geq \tau^+, f(v_{\sigma_{s_i}} | v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i-1}}}) \geq \tau^+, \forall i \in [2, m], \tag{12}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{m} \left| \left\{ v \in (V_0 \cup U_0 \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}) \cap v_{\sigma_{s_i+1:s_{i+1}-1}} : f(v | v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i-1}}}) \in (\tau^-, \tau^+) \right\} \right| \leq b, \tag{13}$$

where

$$V_0 \triangleq \left\{ v \in V : f(v) \geq \tau^+ \right\}, U_0 \triangleq \left\{ v \in V : f(v) \in (\tau^-, \tau^+) \right\}. \tag{14}$$

On an order $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $|S_n| = m$ and $|B_n| \leq b$ if (12) and (13) are true, and

$$f(v | v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}) < \tau^+, \forall v \in v_{\sigma_{s_m+1:n}}. \tag{15}$$

Intuitively, (12) says that the marginal gains of the first m selected elements exceed τ^+; (13) says that the marginal gains of the buffered elements are within (τ^-, τ^+), and the number of them is less than b; (15) says that there is no element whose marginal gain exceeds τ^+ except the m selected ones.

Given τ^- and τ^+, we can obtain m^* in (7), or M, M_1, M_2 in (9) and (10). For $m = m^*$ or $m \in (M_1 \cap M_2) \cup M$, all the possible sequences $(\sigma_{s_{1:m}}) \triangleq (\sigma_{s_1}, \sigma_{s_2}, \cdots, \sigma_{s_m})$ of the first m selected elements that fulfill (12) can be enumerated and stored in a set Φ_s by Algorithm 3 [1]. Each subsequence $(\sigma_{s_{1:m}}) \in \Phi_s$ partitions the whole stream into $m + 1$ segments from 0 to m, where segment i is composed of $v_{\sigma_{s_i+1:s_{i+1}-1}}$. According to (13), whether $|B_n| \leq b$ depends on how to assign elements in $V_0 \cup U_0 \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}$ to the $m + 1$ segments. By computing the proportion of assignments that satisfies (13) among all possible assignments (Proposition 3), we obtain the following order complexity of stream clipper.



Figure 4: Utility $f(S)$ and time cost vs. length of data stream n on the same data of 20 different random orders.

Theorem 3. *Given $\alpha \in [0, 1/2]$, τ^- and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$, for each $(\sigma_{s_{1:m}}) \in \Phi_s$, define $g : V_0 \cup U_0 \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}} \to \{0, 1, \cdots, m\}$ as a mapping from $V_0 \cup U_0 \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}$ to segment indexes. Let*

$$\phi_1(\alpha, m) \triangleq \sum_{(\sigma_{s_{1:m}}) \in \Phi_s} \left| \left\{ g : \left| \left\{ v \in V_0 \cup U_0 \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}} : f(v|v_{\sigma_{1:g(v)}}) \in (\tau^-, \tau^+) \right\} \right| \leq b \right\} \right|,$$
$$\phi_2(m) \triangleq P^m_{|V_0|} \times (m+1)^{|V_0|+|U_0|-m}, \tag{16}$$

Order complexity $\pi(\alpha)$ of stream clipper is

$$\pi(\alpha) \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{\phi_1(\alpha, m^*)}{\phi_2(m^*)}, & \alpha \in [0, 1/e] \\ \frac{\sum_{m \in (M_1 \cap M_2) \cup M} \phi_1(\alpha, m)}{\sum_{m \in (M_1 \cap M_2) \cup M} \phi_2(m)}, & \alpha \in (1/e, 1/2] \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

The mapping g assigns each element in $V_0 \cup U_0 \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}$ to one of the $m+1$ segments. The $\phi_2(m)$ in (16) sums up the number of all possible assignments of $V_0 \cup U_0 \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}$ over all possible choices of subsequence $(\sigma_{s_{1:m}})$ such that $v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}} \subseteq V_0$. The $\phi_1(\alpha, m)$ sums up the number of assignments g such that $|B_n| \leq b$ over all $(\sigma_{s_{1:m}}) \in \Phi_s$. The exact form of $\phi_1(\alpha, m)$ is given in Proposition 3 [1].

In order complexity (17), when $\alpha \in [0, 1/e]$, we only needs to compute denominator as $\phi_2(m)$ and numerator as $\phi_1(\alpha, m)$ for $m = m^*$; when $\alpha \in (1/e, 1/2]$, we needs to sum up $\phi_2(m)$ and $\phi_1(\alpha, m)$ over all $m \in (M_1 \cap M_2) \cup M$ as denominator and numerator.



Figure 5: Relative utility $f(S)/f(S_{greedy})$ and time cost vs. memory size m

Remarks: We can easily extend the approximation bound and order complexity of Algorithm 1 to Algorithm 2 by replacing τ^- and τ^+ in them with τ^-_n and τ^+_n (the thresholds after step n) respectively. Details are given in [1].

3 Experiments

In this section, on several news and video datasets, we compare summaries generated by stream clipper and other algorithms. We use the feature based submodular function $f(S) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \sqrt{c_u(S)}$ as our objective, where $\mathcal{U}$ is a set of features, and $c_u(S) = \sum_{v \in S} \omega_{v,u}$ is a modular score ($\omega_{v,u}$ is the affinity of element v to feature u). This function typically achieves good performance on summarization tasks. Our baseline algorithms are the lazy greedy approach [14] (which has identical output as greedy but is faster) and the "sieve-streaming" [2] approach for streaming submodular maximization, which has low memory requirements as it takes one pass over the data.



Figure 6: Relative utility $f(S)/f(S_{greedy})$ vs. $\hat{f}(S^*)$

3.1 Empirical Study on News

Figure 4 shows how $f(S)$ and time cost varies when we change n. The budget size k of the summary set to the number of sentences in a human generated summary. The buffer size b of stream clipper is fixed to 200, while the number of trials in sieve-streaming is 50, leading to memory requirement of $50k$, which is much larger than $200 + k$ of stream clipper. In order to test how performance varies with the order of stream, for each n, we run same experiment on 20 different random orders of the same data.



Figure 7: Statistics of relative utility $f(S)/f(S_{greedy})$, rough-2 score and F1-score on daily news summarization results of 3823 days' news from New York Times corpus between 1996-2007.

The utility and time cost of both streaming algorithms do not change too much when order changes. The utility curve of stream clipper overlaps that of lazy greedy, while its time cost is much less and increases more slowly than that of lazy greedy. Sieve-streaming performs much worse than SS in terms of utility, and its time

cost is only slightly less and even slightly decreases when increasing n (this is because it quickly fills S with k elements and stops much earlier before seeing all n elements).

Figure 5 shows how relative utility $f(S)/f(S_{greedy})$ (S_{greedy} denotes the solution of greedy algorithm) and time cost of the two streaming algorithms vary with memory size m. Stream clipper quickly reaches a $f(S) \approx 0.97 f(S_{greedy})$ close to $f(S)$ of greedy algorithm once m exceeds 200, while sieve-streaming achieves much smaller $f(S)$ which does not increase until $m \geq 800$. Note the time cost of stream clipper is larger than that of sieve-streaming when $m \leq 400$ but dramatically decreases below it quickly. This is because the buffer clean procedure in A2.L15-17 needs to be frequently executed if the m is small (and b is small). However, a slight increase of memory size can effectively reduce the time cost.



Figure 8: Length of data stream n vs. time cost on daily news summarization of 3823 days' news from New York Times corpus between 1996-2007. The area of each circle is proportional to relative utility $f(S)/f(S_{greedy})$.

Figure 6 shows the robustness of the two streaming algorithms to parameter $\hat{f}(S^*)$. In the wide range of $[100, 400]$, stream clipper keeps a ≥ 0.9 relative utility, while sieve-streaming decreases dramatically around its peak value 0.9. Hence, sieve-streaming is more sensitive to $\hat{f}(S^*)$ and thus a delicate search of $\hat{f}(S^*)$ is necessary. This results in heavy memory load. In opposite, stream clipper can adaptively adjust the two thresholds via swapping and buffer clean even when the estimate $\hat{f}(S^*)$ used to initialize them is inaccurate.

3.2 News Summarization

In this section, we conduct summarization experiments on two large news corpus, The New York Times annotated corpus 1996-2007 (`https://catalog.ldc.upenn.edu/LDC2008T19`), and DUC 2001 corpus (`http://www-nlpir.nist.gov/projects/duc`).

The first dataset includes all the articles published on The New York Times in 3823 days from 1996-2007. For each day, we collect the sentences in articles associated with human generated summary as the ground set V (size varies from 2000 to 20000), and extract their tfidf features to build $f(S)$. We concatenate the sentences from all human generated summaries in the same date as reference summary. We compare the machine generated summaries produced by different methods with the reference summary by ROUGE-2 [12] (recall on 2-grams) and ROUGE-2 F1-score (F1-measure based on recall and precision on 2-grams). We also compare their relative utility. As before, sieve-streaming holds a memory size of $50k$. Figure 7 shows the statistics over 3823 days.

Stream clipper keeps a relative utility ≥ 0.95 for most days, while sieve-streaming dominates the ≤ 0.95 region. The ROUGE-2 score of stream clipper is usually better than sieve-streaming, but slightly worse than lazy greedy. However, its F1-score is very close to that of lazy greedy, while sieve-streaming's is much worse.

Figure 8 shows the number n of collected sentences in each day and the corresponding time cost of each algorithm. The area of each circle is proportional to the relative utility. We use a log scale time axis for better visualization. Stream clipper is $10 \sim 100$ times faster than lazy greedy. Their time cost have similar increasing speed, because as the summary size increases, the greedy stage in stream clipper tends to dominate the computation. The time cost of sieve-streaming decreases when $n \geq 6000$, but its relative utility also reduces fast. This is caused by the aforementioned early stopping problem.

3.3 Video Summarization

We apply lazy greedy, sieve-streaming, and stream clipper to 25 videos from video summarization dataset SumMe [9] (`http://www.vision.ee.ethz.ch/~gyglim/vsum/`). Each video has $1000 \sim 10000$ frames as given in Table 2 [1]. The results are given in [1]. Stream clipper approaches or outperforms lazy greedy and shows high F1-score on most videos, while the time cost is small according to Table 2. Although on a few videos sieve-streaming achieves the best F1-score, in these cases its generated summaries are trivially dominated by the first 15% frames as shown in Figure 11-14.

References

[1] Anonymous Anonymous. Supplementary material for stream clipper. In *Submitted to NIPS*, 2016.

[2] Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, Baharan Mirzasoleiman, Amin Karbasi, and Andreas Krause. Streaming submodular maximization: Massive data summarization on the fly. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 671–680, 2014.

[3] Mohammadhossein Bateni, Mohammadtaghi Hajiaghayi, and Morteza Zadimoghaddam. Submodular secretary problem and extensions. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 9(4):32:1–32:23, 2013.

[4] Anna Bosch, Andrew Zisserman, and Xavier Munoz. Representing shape with a spatial pyramid kernel. In *ACM International Conference on Image and Video Retrieval*, pages 401–408, 2007.

[5] Niv Buchbinder, Moran Feldman, and Roy Schwartz. Online submodular maximization with preemption. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1202–1216, 2015.

[6] Chandra Chekuri, Shalmoli Gupta, and Kent Quanrud. Streaming algorithms for submodular function maximization. *arXiv:1504.08024*, 2015.

[7] Satoru Fujishige. *Submodular functions and optimization*. Annals of discrete mathematics. Elsevier, 2005.

[8] Ryan Gomes and Andreas Krause. Budgeted nonparametric learning from data streams. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2010.

[9] Michael Gygli, Helmut Grabner, Hayko Riemenschneider, and Luc Van Gool. Creating summaries from user videos. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2014.

[10] Rishabh Iyer, Stefanie Jegelka, and Jeff A. Bilmes. Fast semidifferential-based submodular function optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2013.

[11] Jure Leskovec, Andreas Krause, Carlos Guestrin, Christos Faloutsos, Jeanne VanBriesen, and Natalie Glance. Cost-effective outbreak detection in networks. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 420–429, 2007.

[12] Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out: Proceedings of the ACL-04 Workshop*, pages 74–81, 2004.

[13] Hui Lin and Jeff Bilmes. A class of submodular functions for document summarization. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies - Volume 1*, pages 510–520, 2011.

[14] Michel Minoux. Accelerated greedy algorithms for maximizing submodular set functions. In *Optimization Techniques*, volume 7 of *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences*, chapter 27, pages 234–243. 1978.

[15] Baharan Mirzasoleiman, Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, Amin Karbasi, Jan Vondrák, and Andreas Krause. Lazier than lazy greedy. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1812–1818, 2015.

[16] G. L. Nemhauser, L. A. Wolsey, and M. L. Fisher. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—I. *Mathematical Programming*, 14(1):265–294, 1978.

[17] Aude Oliva and Antonio Torralba. Modeling the shape of the scene: A holistic representation of the spatial envelope. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 42(3):145–175, 2001.

[18] Kai Wei, Rishabh Iyer, and Jeff Bilmes. Fast multi-stage submodular maximization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2014.

4 Appendix

4.1 Advanced Stream Clipper

Algorithm 2: `stream_clipper`

Input : $(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)$, k, b, $\hat{f}(S^*)$
Output : S
Initialize: $S \leftarrow \emptyset$, $B \leftarrow \emptyset$, $\Delta\tau = \frac{\hat{f}(S^*)}{20k}$, $\tau^- = \frac{\hat{f}(S^*)}{2k} - \Delta\tau$, $\tau^+ = \frac{\hat{f}(S^*)}{2k} + \Delta\tau$

for $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** n **do**
  if $f(v_i|S) \geq \tau^+$ *and* $|S| < k$ **then**
    $S \leftarrow S \cup v_i$
  else if $f(v_i|S) > \tau^-$ **then**
    $u \in \text{argmax}_{w \in S} f(S \backslash w \cup v)$
    $\rho = [f(S \backslash u \cup v) - f(S)]/|S|$
    if $\rho > 0$ **then**
      $\tau^- \leftarrow \tau^- + f(u|S \backslash u \cup v)$
      $\tau^+ \leftarrow \tau^+ + \rho$
      $S \leftarrow S \backslash u \cup v_i$
    else
      $B \leftarrow B \cup v_i$
  else
    Reject v_i
  while $|B| = b$ **do**
    $\tau^- \leftarrow \min\{\tau^- + \Delta\tau, \tau^+\}$
    $B \leftarrow B \backslash \{v \in B : f(v|S) \leq \tau^-\}$
while $|S| < k$ **do**
  $v^* \in \text{argmax}_{v \in B} f(v|S)$
  $S \leftarrow S \cup v^*$, $B \leftarrow B \backslash v^*$

4.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. We use $j \in [n+1, n+k-|S_n|]$ to index the $(j-n)^{th}$ step of the greedy algorithm in A1.L8-10, while $j = n$ indexes variables after passing n elements and before the greedy procedure in A1.L8-10. Note $j = n + k - |S_n|$ indexes the final step of the greedy procedure. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & f(S^*) \\ & \leq f(S_j \cup S^*) \leq f(S_j) + \sum_{v \in S^* \backslash S_j} f(v|S_j) \\ & \leq f(S_j) + \sum_{v \in S^* \backslash (S_j \cup B_n)} f(v|S_j) + \sum_{v \in S^* \cap B_n} f(v|S_j) \\ & \leq f(S_j) + k_n \tau^- + (k - k_n)[f(S_{j+1}) - f(S_j)]. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

The first inequality uses monotonicity of $f(\cdot)$, while the second one is due to submodularity. The third inequalities follows from set theory along with the fact that f is non-negative monotone non-decreasing. The fourth inequality is a result of applying rejection rule $f(v|S) < \tau^-$ to the k_n rejected elements in $S^* \backslash (S_n \cup B_n)$, and the max greedy selection rule in A1.L9. Rearranging (18) yields

$$[f(S^*) - k_n \tau^-] - f(S_j) \leq (k - k_n)[f(S_{j+1}) - f(S_j)] \tag{19}$$

Let

$$\delta_j = [f(S^*) - k_n \tau^-] - f(S_j), \tag{20}$$

then the rearranged inequality equals to

$$\delta_j \leq (k - k_n)[\delta_j - \delta_{j+1}], \tag{21}$$

When $\delta_j - \delta_{j+1} > 0$, this is exactly

$$\delta_{j+1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{k - k_n}\right) \delta_j. \tag{22}$$

Since in total $k - |S_n|$ elements are selected by the greedy algorithm, applying (22) from $j = n + k - |S_n| - 1$ to $j = n$ yields

$$\delta_{n+k-|S_n|} \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{k - k_n}\right)^{k-|S_n|} \delta_n \leq e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}} \delta_n, \tag{23}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{array}{l} f(S_{sc}) \\ \geq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}}\right) [f(S^*) - k_n\tau^-] + e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}} f(S_n) \\ \geq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}}\right) [f(S^*) - k_n\tau^-] + e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}} |S_n|\tau^+ \end{array} \tag{24}$$

by applying the definition of δ_j. The last inequality is due to

$$f(S_n) = \sum_{v_i \in S_n} f(v_i|S_{i-1}) \geq |S_n|\tau^+, \tag{25}$$

which is the result of selection rule $f(v|S) \geq \tau^+$ used in A1.L2.

When $\delta_j - \delta_{j+1} = 0$, (21) implies $\delta_j \leq 0$, which leads to

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq f(S_j) \geq f(S^*) - k_n\tau^-. \tag{26}$$

Note the right hand side of (24) is a convex combination of $f(S^*) - k_n\tau^-$ and $|S_n|\tau^+$, and thus is smaller than or equal to their maximum. If $f(S^*) - k_n\tau^- \geq |S_n|\tau^+$, (26) directly leads to (24). If $f(S^*) - k_n\tau^- < |S_n|\tau^+$, since (25) is true and $f(S_{sc}) \geq f(S_n)$ (because greedy algorithm cannot decrease $f(\cdot)$), (24) still holds.

This completes the proof. □

4.3 Proof of Theorem 2

The approximation bound given in Theorem 1 depends on k_n, S_n, τ^+, τ^- and $f(S^*)$: $|S_n|$ is known once a summary is requested; thresholds τ^+ and τ^- are pre-defined parameters; $f(S^*)$ is the optimum we need to compare to. However, it is impossible to know k_n if S^* is not given. Hence, we consider the worst bound over all possible values of $k_n \in [0, 1]$, i.e., the minimum of the right hand side of (3) $g(k_n)$,

$$g(k_n) = \left(1 - e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}}\right) \left(f(S^*) - k_n\tau^-\right) + e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}} |S_n|\tau^+. \tag{27}$$

Since $g(k_n)$ has a complex shape, we firstly study its first and second order derivatives.

Lemma 3. *The derivative and second order derivative of $g(k_n)$ are*

$$\begin{array}{rl} \frac{\partial g}{\partial k_n} = & \left[e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}} \left(1 - \frac{k_n(k-|S_n|)}{(k-k_n)^2}\right) - 1\right] \tau^- + \\ & e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}} \frac{k-|S_n|}{(k-k_n)^2} \left[f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+\right], \end{array} \tag{28}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rl} \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial k_n^2} = & e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}} \frac{k-|S_n|}{(k-k_n)^2} \left[(k - 2k_n + |S_n|)\right. \\ & \left.(f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+) - (2k^2 - 3kk_n + |S_n|k_n)\tau^-\right]. \end{array} \tag{29}$$

Proposition 2. *When $f(S^*) \geq k_n\tau^- + |S_n|\tau^+$, the minimum value $\min_{k_n \in [0,k]} g(k_n)$ of the bound $g(k_n)$ given in (3) w.r.t. k_n is either*

$$g(k) = f(S^*) - k\tau^-, \tag{30}$$

or

$$g(0) = \left(1 - e^{-1+\frac{|S_n|}{k}}\right) f(S^*) + e^{-1+\frac{|S_n|}{k}} |S_n|\tau^+. \tag{31}$$

Proof. In discussion of the minimum of $g(k_n)$, we frequently use its derivative and second order derivative w.r.t. k_n. For simplicity, we use $g^{'}(k_n)$ to denote $\frac{\partial g}{\partial k_n}$ and $g^{''}(k_n)$ to denote $\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial k_n^2}$.

The second order derivative in (29) can be represented as the product of a positive function $u(k_n)$ and a linear function $v(k_n)$ of k_n, i.e.,

$$g^{''}(k_n) = u(k_n) \cdot v(k_n), \tag{32}$$

where

$$u(k_n) = e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k-k_n}} \frac{k-|S_n|}{(k-k_n)^2}, \tag{33}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} v(k_n) = \quad & (k - 2k_n + |S_n|)(f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+) - \\ & (2k^2 - 3kk_n + |S_n|k_n)\tau^-. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

In order to study the monotonicity of $g^{'}(k_n)$ in $k_n \in [0, k]$, we have to study the sign of $g^{''}(k_n)$ given in (32). Since $u(k_n)$ is always positive, the sign of $g^{''}(k_n)$ depends on the sign of $v(k_n)$.

The straight line $v(k_n)$ starts from $[0, v(0)]$, and ends at $[k, v(k)]$ with

$$v(k) = (|S_n| - k)\left[f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+ - k\tau^-\right] \leq 0. \tag{35}$$

Since we already know $v(k_n)$ is linear and monotone and $v(k) \leq 0$, how the sign of $v(k_n)$ changes in $k_n \in [0, k]$ depends on the sign of $v(0)$. The following discusses two cases when $v(0) \leq 0$ and $v(0) \geq 0$.

1. When $v(0) \leq 0$, $v(k_n)$ is non-positive due to its monotonicity of linear function, that is, $v(k_n) \leq 0$ for all $k_n \in [0, k]$. Combining with the fact $u(k_n) \geq 0$, we have $g^{''}(k_n) \leq 0$. Hence $g^{'}(k_n)$ is decreasing monotonically in $k_n \in [0, k]$. Because

$$g^{'}(k) = -\tau^- \leq 0, \tag{36}$$

we now only need to discuss two cases, $g^{'}(0) \geq 0$ and $g^{'}(0) \leq 0$.

   1.1. When $g^{'}(0) \geq 0$, since $g^{'}(k_n)$ is monotonically decreasing, $g^{'}(k_n)$ starts from a nonnegative value $g^{'}(0)$ at $k_n = 0$, passes $g^{'}(k_n) = 0$ and keeps negative till $k_n = k$. Hence, $g(k_n)$ firstly increases and then decreases in $k_n \in [0, k]$. Therefore, $\min_{k_n \in [0,k]} g(k_n)$ has to be either $g(0)$ or $g(k)$.

   1.2. When $g^{'}(0) \leq 0$, since $g^{'}(k_n)$ is decreasing monotonically and $g^{'}(k) \leq 0$, $g^{'}(k_n) \leq 0$ in $k_n \in [0, k]$. Hence, $g(k_n)$ monotonically decreases in $k_n \in [0, k]$. Therefore, $\min_{k_n \in [0,k]} g(k_n) = g(k)$.

2. When $v(0) \geq 0$, i.e.,

$$f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+ \geq \frac{2k^2}{k + |S_n|} \cdot \tau^-, \tag{37}$$

since $v(k_n)$ is linear and $v(k) \leq 0$ in (35), it monotonically decreases in $k_n \in [0, k]$. Because $u(k_n)$ is positive, $g^{''}(k_n)$ starts from a nonnegative value $g^{''}(0)$, passes zero and ends at a non-positive value $g^{''}(k)$. This implies $g^{'}(k_n)$ firstly increases and then decreases in $k_n \in [0, k]$. In order to decide the shape of $g(k_n)$, we further need the sign of $g^{'}(0)$ and $g^{'}(k)$.

   We already know $g^{'}(k) \leq 0$ from (36). So we only need to determine whether $g^{'}(0) \geq 0$ or not. According to the derivative given in (28),

$$\begin{aligned} g^{'}(0) = \quad & e^{-\frac{k-|S_n|}{k}} \left[\left(1 - e^{\frac{k-|S_n|}{k}}\right)\tau^- + \right. \\ & \left. \frac{k-|S_n|}{k^2}\left(f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

   Applying the inequality (37) to the second term of the right hand side in above equation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - e^{\frac{k-|S_n|}{k}}\right)\tau^- + \frac{k-|S_n|}{k^2}\left(f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+\right) \geq \\ \left[1 - e^{\frac{k-|S_n|}{k}} + \frac{2(k-|S_n|)}{k+|S_n|}\right]\tau^-. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Let

$$h(|S_n|) = 1 - e^{\frac{k-|S_n|}{k}} + \frac{2(k-|S_n|)}{k+|S_n|}, \tag{40}$$

then

$$h^{'}(|S_n|) = e^{\frac{k-|S_n|}{k}} - \frac{4k^2}{(k+|S_n|)^2}. \tag{41}$$

It is not hard to verify both $e^{\frac{k-|S_n|}{k}}$ and $\frac{4k^2}{(k+|S_n|)^2}$ decreases monotonically w.r.t. $|S_n|$. In addition, the former is smaller than the latter when $|S_n| = 0$ and equal to the latter when $|S_n| = k$, so $\frac{4k^2}{(k+|S_n|)^2} \geq e^{\frac{k-|S_n|}{k}}$ in $|S_n| \in [0, k]$. Hence, $h^{'}(|S_n|) \leq 0$ and thus $h(|S_n|)$ monotonically decreases. Therefore,

$$h(|S_n|) \geq h(k) = 0. \tag{42}$$

Recall (39) and (38), we have $g^{'}(0) \geq 0$. So $g^{'}(k_n)$ starts from a nonnegative value at $k_n = 0$, firstly increases and then decreases to a non-positive value at $k_n = k$. Hence, $g(k_n)$ increases at first and then decreases in $k_n \in [0, k]$. Therefore, $\min_{k_n \in [0,k]} g(k_n)$ has to be either $g(0)$ or $g(k)$.

This completes the discussion of all possible cases and thus finishes the proof. □

By using Proposition 2, we can derive the minimum value of bound (3) in three different cases, which corresponds to three ranges of $f(S^*)$ determined by τ^+, τ^- and $|S_n|$. This leads to the following proof to Theorem 2.

Proof. We prove the lower bound in three difference cases given in Theorem 2. Note the bound given in (3) is a convex combination of $f(S^*) - k_n\tau^-$ and $|S_n|\tau^+$. In the first case, we do not use (3) to derive the bound because the condition for the first case equals to $f(S^*) - k_n\tau^- \leq |S_n|\tau^+$. So the largest value (3) can achieve is $|S_n|\tau^+$. But according to (25), we have $f(S_n) \geq |S_n|\tau^+$.

Since greedy algorithm always improves the objective $f(S_{sc})$ i.e., $f(S_{sc}) \geq f(S_n)$, we have

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq f(S_n) \geq |S_n|\tau^+ \tag{43}$$

In addition, $k_n \leq k$ and $|S_n| \leq k$ lead to

$$f(S^*) \leq k_n\tau^- + |S_n|\tau^+ \leq k(\tau^- + \tau^+) \leq 2k\tau^+, \tag{44}$$

which indicates $\tau^+ \geq \frac{f(S^*)}{2k}$. Combining with (43), we have

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq |S_n|\tau^+ \geq \frac{|S_n|}{k} \times \frac{f(S^*)}{2}. \tag{45}$$

The proof for the other two cases relies on Proposition 2. According to it, in the second and third case when $f(S^*) \geq k_n\tau^- + |S_n|\tau^+$, the minimum of the lower bound in (3) w.r.t. $k_n \in [0, 1]$ is either $g(k)$ given in (30) or $g(0)$ given in (31). So we only need to find out which one is smaller in each case since we are searching for the worst bound w.r.t. k_n.

According to Theorem 2, the condition for the second case is

$$f(S^*) \leq e^{1-\frac{|S_n|}{k}} k\tau^- + |S_n|\tau^+, \tag{46}$$

which is a rearrangement of $g(k) \leq g(0)$, i.e.,

$$f(S^*) - k\tau^- \leq \left(1 - e^{-1+\frac{|S_n|}{k}}\right) f(S^*) + e^{-1+\frac{|S_n|}{k}} |S_n|\tau^+. \tag{47}$$

Therefore, the lower bound in the second case is $f(S^*) - k\tau^-$.

In the third case, by reversing the inequalities in both (46) and (47), we can prove $g(0) \leq g(k)$ and thus the lower bound of the third case is $g(0)$. This completes the proof. □

4.4 Proof of Corollary 1

Proof. In the first case, according to (4), by using $\tau^- \leq \frac{f(S^*)}{2k}$, we have

$$f(S) \geq |S_n|\tau^+ \geq f(S^*) - k_n\tau^- \geq \left(1 - \frac{k_n}{2k}\right) f(S^*) \geq \frac{f(S^*)}{2}. \tag{48}$$

In the second case, the condition is equivalent to

$$\frac{f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+}{ke^{1-\frac{|S_n|}{k}}} \leq \tau^- \leq \frac{f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+}{k_n}. \tag{49}$$

Since the lower bound $f(S^*) - k_n\tau^-$ (5) increases when reducing τ^-, its maximum w.r.t. τ^- is achieved when $\tau^- = (f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+)/(ke^{1-\frac{|S_n|}{k}})$., i.e.,

$$f(S^*) - k\tau^- = \left(1 - e^{-1+\frac{|S_n|}{k}}\right) f(S^*) + e^{-1+\frac{|S_n|}{k}}|S_n|\tau^+, \tag{50}$$

which is exactly the same bound (6) for the third case.

In the third case, by substituting $|S_n| = 0$ into (6), the bound in the third case becomes

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq \left(1 - e^{-1}\right) f(S^*). \tag{51}$$

This completes the proof. □

4.5 Proof of Proposition 5

For simplicity in notations, in the following proof, we use "+" for set union operator "∪" and "−" for set subtraction operator "\".

Proof. It can be proved as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ll} & f(w|S-u+v) \\ = & f(w+S-u+v) - f(S+v) + \\ & [f(S+v) - f(S-u+v)] \\ = & f(w+S-u+v) - f(S+v) + f(u|S-u+v) \\ = & f(w+S-u+v) - f(w+S+v) + \\ & [f(w+S+v) - f(S+v)] + f(u|S-u+v) \\ = & f(w|S+v) + f(u|S-u+v) - f(u|w+S-u+v) \\ \leq & f(w|S) + f(u|S-b+v) - f(u|w+S-u+v) \\ \leq & f(w|S) + f(u|S-u+v). \end{array} \tag{52}$$

The first inequality is due to submodularity, and the second inequality is a result of nonnegativity. □

4.6 Proof of Proposition 1

The following corollary is derived from the bound of Case 1 in Theorem 2.

Corollary 2. *For $\alpha \in [0, k_n/k]$, given τ^- and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$, if*

$$m^* \triangleq \min\left\{m \in [n] : \tau^+ \geq \frac{(1-\alpha)f(S^*)}{m}\right\}, \frac{\alpha f(S^*)}{k_n} \leq \tau^- \leq \tau^+, \tag{53}$$

for any order $\sigma \in \Phi_1(\alpha)$ where

$$\Phi_1(\alpha) \triangleq \{\sigma \in \Sigma : |S_n| \geq m^*, |B_n| \leq b\}, \tag{54}$$

we have

$$f(S) \geq (1-\alpha)f(S^*). \tag{55}$$

Proof. The inequalities about τ^- and τ^+ in (53) lead to

$$k_n\tau^- \geq \alpha f(S^*) = f(S^*) - (1-\alpha)f(S^*) \geq f(S^*) - m^*\tau^+ \geq f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+, \tag{56}$$

which after rearrangement is the condition for Case 1 in Theorem 2. Substitute the inequality about τ^+ into the bound (4) for Case 1, we have

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq (1-\alpha)f(S^*). \tag{57}$$

Our assumption requires $|B_n| \geq k - |S_n|$, which requires $\tau^- \leq f(S^*)/k$ because otherwise $|B_n| + |S_n| \leq k$. So the lower bound of τ^- in (53) needs to satisfy

$$\frac{\alpha f(S^*)}{k_n} \leq \tau^- \leq \frac{f(S^*)}{k}, \tag{58}$$

which equals to $\alpha \in [0, k_n/k]$. In addition, the buffer size limit requires $|B_i| \leq b \; \forall i \in [n]$. Since $|B_i| \leq |B_{i+1}|$, we require $|B_n| \leq b$. This complete the proof. □

The following corollary is derived from the bound of Case 2 in Theorem 2.

Corollary 3. *For $\alpha \in [0, 1/2]$, given τ^- and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$, if*

$$\tau^- \leq \frac{\alpha f(S^*)}{k}, M \triangleq \left\{ m \in [n] : \frac{f(S^*) - e^{1-\frac{m}{k}} k\tau^-}{m} < \tau^+ < \frac{f(S^*) - k\tau^-}{m} \right\}, \tag{59}$$

for any order $\sigma \in \Phi_2(\alpha) \triangleq \bigcup_{m \in M} \Psi_2(\alpha, m)$ where

$$\Psi_2(\alpha, m) \triangleq \{\sigma \in \Sigma : |S_n| = m, |B_n| \leq b\}, \tag{60}$$

we have

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq (1-\alpha)f(S^*). \tag{61}$$

Proof. Since $|S_n| = m$, rearranging the inequality about τ^+ in (59) leads to the condition for Case 2 in Theorem 2, i.e.,

$$k_n\tau^- + |S_n|\tau^+ < f(S^*) < e^{1-\frac{|S_n|}{k}} k\tau^- + |S_n|\tau^+. \tag{62}$$

Substituting the inequality about τ^- in (59) into the bound (5) for Case 2 results in

$$f(S) \geq (1-\alpha)f(S^*). \tag{63}$$

The above holds for all $m \in M$. The buffer size limit requires $|B_n| \leq b$. This completes the proof. □

The following corollary is derived from the bound of Case 3 in Theorem 2.

Corollary 4. *1) When $\alpha \in [0, 1/e]$, given τ^- and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$, if*

$$m^* \triangleq \min \left\{ m \in [n] : \tau^+ \geq \frac{(1 - e^{1-m/k}\alpha) f(S^*)}{m}, \tau^- \leq \frac{f(S^*) - m\tau^+}{e^{1-m/k}k} \right\}, \tag{64}$$

for any order $\sigma \in \Phi_3(\alpha)$ where

$$\Phi_3(\alpha) \triangleq \{\sigma \in \Sigma : |S_n| \geq m^*, |B_n| \leq b\}, \tag{65}$$

we have

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq (1-\alpha)f(S^*). \tag{66}$$

2) When $\alpha \in (1/e, 1/2]$, given τ^- and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$, if

$$M_1 \triangleq \left\{ m \in [n] : \frac{(1-\alpha)f(S^*)}{k} \leq \tau^+ \leq \frac{f(S^*)}{m+k} \right\}, M_2 \triangleq \left\{ m \in [n] : \tau^- \leq \frac{f(S^*) - m\tau^+}{e^{1-m/k}k} \right\}, \tag{67}$$

for any order $\sigma \in \Phi_3(\alpha) \triangleq \bigcup_{m \in M_1 \cap M_2} \Psi_3(\alpha, m)$ where

$$\Psi_3(\alpha, m) \triangleq \{\sigma \in \Sigma : |S_n| = m, |B_n| \leq b\}, \tag{68}$$

we have

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq (1-\alpha)f(S^*), \tag{69}$$

Proof. When 1) $\alpha \in [0, 1/e]$, because the increasing monotonicity

$$\partial \left(\frac{f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+}{e^{1-|S_n|/k}k} \right) / \partial |S_n| = \frac{(k - |S_n|)\tau^+ + f(S^*)}{k^2 e^{1-|S_n|/k}} > 0, \tag{70}$$

and $|S_n| \geq m^*$ in 65, the inequality about τ^- in (64) leads to

$$\tau^- \leq \frac{f(S^*) - m^*\tau^+}{e^{1-m^*/k}k} \leq \frac{f(S^*) - |S_n|\tau^+}{e^{1-|S_n|/k}k}, \tag{71}$$

which after rearranging is the condition for Case 3 in Theorem 2. Since $\alpha \leq 1/e$, we have

$$\partial \left[\frac{(1 - e^{1-|S_n|/k}\alpha) f(S^*)}{|S_n|} \right] / \partial |S_n| = \frac{f(S^*) \left[\alpha e^{1-|S_n|/k}(1 + |S_n|/k) - 1 \right]}{|S_n|^2} \leq \frac{f(S^*) \left[\alpha e - 1 \right]}{|S_n|^2} \leq 0, \tag{72}$$

where the first inequality is due to $1 + x \leq e^x$. So for $|S_n| \geq m^*$, combining the above non-increasing monotonicity and the inequality about τ^+ in (64) yields

$$\tau^+ \geq \frac{(1 - e^{1-m^*/k}\alpha) f(S^*)}{m^*} \geq \frac{(1 - e^{1-|S_n|/k}\alpha) f(S^*)}{|S_n|}. \tag{73}$$

Substituting the above inequality into bound (6) for Case 3 results in

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq (1 - \alpha) f(S^*). \tag{74}$$

When 2) $\alpha \in (1/e, 1/2]$, for each $m \in M_1 \cap M_2$, we have

$$\tau^- \leq \frac{f(S^*) - m\tau^+}{e^{1-m/k}k}, \tag{75}$$

which after rearranging is the condition for Case 3 in Theorem 2. According to the inequality about τ^+ in (67), for each $m \in M_1 \cap M_2$, we have

$$\frac{(1 - \alpha) f(S^*)}{k} \leq \tau^+ \leq \frac{f(S^*)}{m + k}, \tag{76}$$

where the right inequality indicates that the bound (6) for Case 3 is monotone decreasing w.r.t. $|S_n|$ because the derivative of the bound (6) w.r.t. $|S_n|$ is

$$\frac{e^{-1+|S_n|/k}}{k} \times \left[(m + k)\tau^+ - f(S^*) \right] \leq 0. \tag{77}$$

So the bound (6) for $|S_n| = m$ is larger than the bound when $|S_n| = k$, which is $k\tau^+$. By using the left inequality in (76), we have

$$f(S_{sc}) \geq (1 - \alpha) f(S^*). \tag{78}$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4. *When* $\alpha \in [0, 1/e]$, $\Phi_2(\alpha) \subseteq \Phi_3(\alpha)$.

Proof. When $\alpha \in [0, 1/e]$, for any $m \in M$, if the given τ^- and $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$ fulfill the inequalities in (59), they also fulfill the inequalities in (64), because 1)

$$\tau^- \leq \frac{\alpha f(S^*)}{k} \leq \frac{f(S^*)}{ek} \leq \frac{f(S^*) - m^*\tau^+}{e^{1-m^*/k}k} \tag{79}$$

the last inequality is due to the monotonicity according to the derivative given in (70), so τ^- fulfills the inequality about τ^- in (64); and 2)

$$\tau^+ > \frac{f(S^*) - e^{1-\frac{m}{k}}k\tau^-}{m} \geq \frac{(1 - e^{1-m/k}\alpha) f(S^*)}{m} \geq \frac{(1 - e^{1-m^*/k}\alpha) f(S^*)}{m^*}, \tag{80}$$

the second inequality is due to $\tau^- \leq \frac{\alpha f(S^*)}{k}$, the third inequality is due to the monotonicity according to the derivative given in (72), so τ^+ fulfills the inequality about τ^+ in (64). This completes the proof. □

Since k_n in (53) cannot be known, we will not use Corollary 2 to derive order complexity. Combing the results of Corollary 3 and Corollary 4 by using Lemma 4 yields Proposition 1.

4.7 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. Because of (12), we have

$$S_n \supseteq v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}, |S_n| \geq m. \tag{81}$$

The subsequence of the first m selected elements $v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}$ split the whole stream into $m+1$ parts from segment 0 to segment m, where segment i is composed of $v_{\sigma_{s_i+1:s_{i+1}-1}}$. The set of buffered elements in segment i is

$$\left\{v \in (V_0 \cup U_0 \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}) \cap v_{\sigma_{s_i+1:s_{i+1}-1}} : f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i-1}}}) \in (\tau^-, \tau^+)\right\}. \tag{82}$$

Since B_n contains the buffered elements in all $m+1$ segments, (13) equals to $|B_n| \leq b$.

Similarly, on an order $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $|S_n| = m$ and $|B_n| \leq b$ if (12) and (13) are true, and the marginal gains of all the elements in segment m are less than τ^+, i.e., $f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}) < \tau^+, \forall v \in v_{\sigma_{s_m+1:n}}$. This completes the proof. □

4.8 Algorithm giving Φ_s

Algorithm 3: `find_selected_top_down`

Input : $V, \alpha, m, \tau^-, \tau^+$
Output : Φ_s
Initialize : $\Phi_s \leftarrow \emptyset$

$V_0 := \{v \in V : f(v) \geq \tau^+\}$
if $V_0 \neq \emptyset$ **then**
  for $v_{\sigma_{s_1}} \in V_0$ **do**
    $V_1 := \left\{v \in V_0 \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_1}} : f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_1}}) \geq \tau^+\right\}$
    if $V_1 \neq \emptyset$ **then**
      for $v_{\sigma_{s_2}} \in V_1$ **do**
        $\cdots$
        $V_i := \left\{v \in V_{i-1} \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_i}} : f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}) \geq \tau^+\right\}$
        if $V_i \neq \emptyset$ **then**
          for $v_{\sigma_{s_i}} \in V_i$ **do**
            $\cdots$
            $V_{m-1} := \left\{v \in V_{m-2} \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{m-1}}} : f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m-1}}}) \geq \tau^+\right\}$
            if $V_{m-1} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
              for $v_{\sigma_{s_m}} \in V_{m-1}$ **do**
                if $\alpha \in (1/e, 1/2]$ **then**
                  $V_m := \left\{v \in V_{m-1} \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_m}} : f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}) \geq \tau^+\right\}$
                  if $V_m = \emptyset$ **then**
                    $\Phi_s \leftarrow \Phi_s \cup (\sigma_{s_1}, \sigma_{s_2}, \cdots, \sigma_{s_m})$
                else if $\alpha \in [0, 1/e]$ **then**
                  $\Phi_s \leftarrow \Phi_s \cup (\sigma_{s_1}, \sigma_{s_2}, \cdots, \sigma_{s_m})$

4.9 Proposition 3

Proposition 3. *Given $\alpha \in [0, 1/2]$, τ^-, $\tau^+ \geq \tau^-$ and m, $\phi_1(\alpha, m)$ in (16) is*

$$\phi_1(\alpha, m) = \sum_{(\sigma_{s_{1:m}}) \in \Phi_s} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{b_i=0}^{\min\left\{|Y_i|+|U_i|-\sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\left(b_j^{y_{j:m}}+\sum_{\ell=j}^{m} b_j^{y_{j:\ell} w_{\ell+1}}+b_j^{u_m}+\sum_{\ell=i}^{m} b_j^{u_\ell u_{\ell+1}}\right), b-b'-\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} b_i\right\}} E_i^{b_i}(v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}), \tag{83}$$

where

$$E_i^{b_i}(v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}) \triangleq \left(\prod_{j=i}^{m} \sum_{b_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}}=0}^{\min\left\{b_i-\sum_{\ell=i}^{j-1} b_i^{y_{i:\ell}w_{\ell+1}}, c_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}}-\sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{y_{\ell:j}w_{j+1}}\right\}} C_{c_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}}-\sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{y_{\ell:j}w_{j+1}}}^{b_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}}}\right) \times \sum_{b_i^{y_{i:m}}=0}^{\min\left\{b_i-\sum_{\ell=i}^{m} b_i^{y_{i:\ell}w_{\ell+1}}, c_i^{y_{i:m}}-\sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{y_{\ell:m}}\right\}} C_{c_i^{y_{i:m}}-\sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{y_{\ell:m}}}^{b_i^{y_{i:m}}} \times \left(\prod_{j=i}^{m} \sum_{b_i^{u_j u_{j+1}}=0}^{\min\left\{b_i-\sum_{\ell=i}^{m} b_i^{y_{i:\ell}w_{\ell+1}}-b_i^{y_{i:m}}, c_j-\sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{u_j u_{j+1}}\right\}} C_{c_j-\sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{u_j u_{j+1}}}^{b_i^{u_j u_{j+1}}}\right) \times \sum_{b_i^{u_m}=0}^{\min\left\{b_i-\sum_{\ell=i}^{m}(b_i^{y_{i:\ell}w_{\ell+1}}+b_i^{u_\ell u_{\ell+1}})-b_i^{y_{i:m}}, c_m-\sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{u_m}\right\}} C_{c_m-\sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{u_m}}^{b_i^{u_m}}, \tag{84}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i &\triangleq \left\{v \in V_0 : f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}) \in (\tau^-, \tau^+)\right\}, \\ U_i &\triangleq \left\{v \in U_0 : f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}) \in (\tau^-, \tau^+)\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

and

$$b^{'} = \left|\left\{v \in V\backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}} : f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}) \geq \tau^-\right\}\right|, \tag{86}$$

and

$$c_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}} = \left|W_{j+1} \cap \bigcap_{\ell=i}^{j} Y_\ell\right|, c_i^{y_{i:m}} = \left|\bigcap_{\ell=i}^{m} Y_\ell\right|, c_j = |U_j\backslash U_{j+1}|, c_m = |U_m|. \tag{87}$$

Proof. The set of elements in $V_0 \cup U_0\backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}$ that can be buffered in segment i is $Y_i \cup U_i$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i &\triangleq \left\{v \in V_0 : f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}) \in (\tau^-, \tau^+)\right\}, \\ U_i &\triangleq \left\{v \in U_0 : f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}) \in (\tau^-, \tau^+)\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

The set of elements in $V_0 \cup U_0\backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}$ that can be rejected in segment i to segment m is W_i such that

$$W_i \triangleq \left\{v \in V_0 \cup U_0 : f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}) \leq \tau^-\right\}. \tag{89}$$

The set of buffered elements $\mathcal{B}_i$ in segment i can be decomposed as the union of several disjoint subsets ((we use "+" to denote the union operator between disjoint sets), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_i = \; & \left(\mathcal{B}_i^{y_i w_{i+1}} + \mathcal{B}_i^{y_{i:i+1}w_{i+2}} + \cdots + \mathcal{B}_i^{y_{i:m-1}w_m}\right) + \mathcal{B}_i^{y_{i:m}} + \\ & \left(\mathcal{B}_i^{u_i u_{i+1}} + \mathcal{B}_i^{u_{i+1}u_{i+2}} + \cdots + \mathcal{B}_i^{u_{m-1}u_m}\right) + \mathcal{B}_i^{u_m}, \end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

where elements in $\mathcal{B}_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}}$ for all $j \in [i+1, m-1]$ are selected from

$$\mathcal{B}_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}} \subseteq \left(W_{j+1} \cap \bigcap_{\ell=i}^{j} Y_\ell\right) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{B}_\ell^{y_{\ell:j}w_{j+1}}\right), \tag{91}$$

and elements in $\mathcal{B}_i^{y_{i:m}}$ are selected from

$$\mathcal{B}_i^{y_{i:m}} \subseteq \left(\bigcap_{\ell=i}^{m} Y_\ell\right) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{B}_\ell^{y_{\ell:m}}\right), \tag{92}$$

and elements in $\mathcal{B}_i^{u_j u_{j+1}}$ are selected from

$$\mathcal{B}_i^{u_j u_{j+1}} \subseteq (U_j\backslash U_{j+1}) \setminus \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{B}_\ell^{u_j u_{j+1}}, \tag{93}$$

and elements in $\mathcal{B}_i^{u_m}$ are selected from

$$\mathcal{B}_i^{u_m} \subseteq U_m\backslash \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{B}_\ell^{u_m}. \tag{94}$$

Denote the sizes of the subsets in the left hand sides of (91)-(94) by

$$b_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}} = |\mathcal{B}_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}}|, c_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}} = \left| W_{j+1} \cap \bigcap_{\ell=i}^{j} Y_\ell \right|, \tag{95}$$

and

$$b_i^{y_{i:m+1}} = |\mathcal{B}_i^{y_{i:m}}|, c_i^{y_{i:m}} = \left| \bigcap_{\ell=i}^{m} Y_\ell \right|. \tag{96}$$

and

$$b_i^{u_j u_{j+1}} = |\mathcal{B}_i^{u_j u_{j+1}}|, c_j = |U_j \backslash U_{j+1}|, \tag{97}$$

and

$$b_i^{u_m} = |\mathcal{B}_i^{u_m}|, c_m = |U_m|, \tag{98}$$

then the sizes of the supersets in the right hand sides of (91)-(94) are

$$\left| \left(W_{j+1} \cap \bigcap_{\ell=i}^{j} Y_\ell \right) \backslash \left(\bigcup_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{B}_\ell^{y_{\ell:j}w_{j+1}} \right) \right| = c_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}} - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{y_{\ell:j}w_{j+1}}, \tag{99}$$

and

$$\left| \left(\bigcap_{\ell=i}^{m} Y_\ell \right) \backslash \left(\bigcup_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{B}_\ell^{y_{\ell:m}} \right) \right| = c_i^{y_{i:m}} - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{y_{\ell:m}}. \tag{100}$$

and

$$\left| (U_j \backslash U_{j+1}) \backslash \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{B}_\ell^{u_j u_{j+1}} \right| = c_j - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{u_j u_{j+1}}, \tag{101}$$

and

$$\left| U_m \backslash \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{B}_\ell^{u_m} \right| = c_m - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{u_m}. \tag{102}$$

If the number of buffered elements in segment i is b_i, the number of combinations of buffered elements in $\mathcal{B}_i$ is

$$\begin{aligned} E_i^{b_i}(v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}) \triangleq & \left(\prod_{j=i}^{m} \sum_{b_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}}=0}^{\min\left\{b_i - \sum_{\ell=i}^{j-1} b_i^{y_{i:\ell}w_{\ell+1}}, c_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}} - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{y_{\ell:j}w_{j+1}}\right\}} C_{c_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}} - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{y_{\ell:j}w_{j+1}}}^{b_i^{y_{i:j}w_{j+1}}} \right) \times \\ & \sum_{b_i^{y_{i:m}}=0}^{\min\left\{b_i - \sum_{\ell=i}^{m} b_i^{y_{i:\ell}w_{\ell+1}}, c_i^{y_{i:m}} - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{y_{\ell:m}}\right\}} C_{c_i^{y_{i:m}} - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{y_{\ell:m}}}^{b_i^{y_{i:m}}} \times \\ & \left(\prod_{j=i}^{m} \sum_{b_i^{u_j u_{j+1}}=0}^{\min\left\{b_i - \sum_{\ell=i}^{m} b_i^{y_{i:\ell}w_{\ell+1}} - b_i^{y_{i:m}}, c_j - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{u_j u_{j+1}}\right\}} C_{c_j - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{u_j u_{j+1}}}^{b_i^{u_j u_{j+1}}} \right) \times \\ & \sum_{b_i^{u_m}=0}^{\min\left\{b_i - \sum_{\ell=i}^{m} (b_i^{y_{i:\ell}w_{\ell+1}} + b_i^{u_\ell u_{\ell+1}}) - b_i^{y_{i:m}}, c_m - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{u_m}\right\}} C_{c_m - \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} b_\ell^{u_m}}^{b_i^{u_m}}. \end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

The four terms above are the number of combinations of buffered elements in the four subsets of $\mathcal{B}_i$ in (90), respectively. In the following, we discuss the possible choices of b_i from segment 0 to m.

Because the buffered elements in segment i have be to selected from

$$\mathcal{B}_i \subseteq Y_i \backslash \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} B_j^{y_{j:i}} + U_i \backslash \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{B}_j^{u_{j:i}}, \tag{104}$$

whose size is

$$|Y_i| + |U_i| - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \left(b_j^{y_{j:m}} + \sum_{\ell=j}^{m} b_j^{y_{j:\ell}w_{\ell+1}} + b_j^{u_m} + \sum_{\ell=i}^{m} b_j^{u_\ell u_{\ell+1}} \right), \tag{105}$$

Due to the buffer size limit $|B_n| \leq b$, the maximal number of buffered elements in segment i is

$$b_i \leq \min\left\{ |Y_i| + |U_i| - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \left(b_j^{y_{j:m}} + \sum_{\ell=j}^{m} b_j^{y_{j:\ell} w_{\ell+1}} + b_j^{u_m} + \sum_{\ell=i}^{m} b_j^{u_\ell u_{\ell+1}} \right), b - b^{'} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} b_i \right\}, \tag{106}$$

where

$$b^{'} = \left| \left\{ v \in V \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}} : f(v|v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}) \geq \tau^{-} \right\} \right|. \tag{107}$$

Given selected subsequence of selected elements $(v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}})$, the number of assignments of $V_0 \cup U_0 \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}$ that guarantees $|B| \leq b$ is

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \left\{ g : \left| \left\{ v \in (V_0 \cup U_0 \backslash v_{\sigma_{s_{1:m}}}) : f(v|v_{\sigma_{1:g(v)}}) \in (\tau^{-}, \tau^{+}) \right\} \right| \leq b \right\} \right| = \\ &\prod_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{b_i=0}^{\min\left\{ |Y_i| + |U_i| - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \left(b_j^{y_{j:m}} + \sum_{\ell=j}^{m} b_j^{y_{j:\ell} w_{\ell+1}} + b_j^{u_m} + \sum_{\ell=i}^{m} b_j^{u_\ell u_{\ell+1}} \right), b - b^{'} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} b_i \right\}} E_i^{b_i}(v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}). \end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

Therefore, $\phi(\alpha, m)$ in (16) is

$$\sum_{(\sigma_{s_{1:m}}) \in \Phi_s} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{b_i=0}^{\min\left\{ |Y_i| + |U_i| - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \left(b_j^{y_{j:m}} + \sum_{\ell=j}^{m} b_j^{y_{j:\ell} w_{\ell+1}} + b_j^{u_m} + \sum_{\ell=i}^{m} b_j^{u_\ell u_{\ell+1}} \right), b - b^{'} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} b_i \right\}} E_i^{b_i}(v_{\sigma_{s_{1:i}}}). \tag{109}$$

This completes the proof. □

4.10 Extending Analysis of Algorithm 1 to Algorithm 2

Comparing to Algorithm 1 that fixes τ^{-} and τ^{+} as constants, Algorithm 2 updates τ^{-} and τ^{+} within the two strategies (A2.L8, L9, L16). The changes in thresholds may lead to difference in theoretical analysis. The following analysis shows how to extend the approximation bound and order complexity of Algorithm 1 to Algorithm 2.

Firstly, we study the reason for increasing τ^{-} in A2.L8 of swapping procedure. The following Lemma indicates how marginal gain $f(w|S)$ changes after swapping.

Lemma 5. *If $f(\cdot)$ is a normalized submodular function, $u \in S$, $v, w \notin S$, then the following holds.*

$$f(w|S \backslash u \cup v) \leq f(w|S) + f(u|S \backslash u \cup v). \tag{110}$$

The proof is given in [1]. In the following, we use τ_i^{-} and τ_i^{+} to denote τ^{-} and τ^{+} at the end (i.e., at A2.L17) of step i.

Theorem 4. *The approximation bound and order complexity of Algorithm 1 holds true for Algorithm 2, if τ^{-} and τ^{+} in Section 2.3 and Section 2.4 are replaced respectively by τ_n^{-} and τ_n^{+}.*

Proof. For Algorithm 2, after replacing τ^{-} and τ^{+} by τ_n^{-} and τ_n^{+} respectively, the analysis in Section 2.3 and Section 2.4 holds true if

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall v \in V \backslash (S_n \cup B_n), f(v|S_n) \leq \tau_n^{-}, \\ &f(S_n) \geq |S_n| \tau_n^{+}, \end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

because the first condition in (111) leads to the third inequality in (18), while the second condition results in (25), where τ^{-} and τ^{+} are replaced by τ_n^{-} and τ_n^{+}. The rest reasoning follows the proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, and lead to the same approximation bound and order complexity.

In the following, we prove (111) is true. Firstly, if v_i is rejected in step i, and the first swapping since step i happens at step $j > i$, i.e., some element $u \in S_{j-1}$ is replaced by v_j, the marginal gain $f(v_i|S_j)$ can be upper bounded by using Lemma 5, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} f(v_i|S_j) \quad &\leq f(v_i|S_{j-1}) + f(u|S_j) \leq f(v_i|S_i) + f(u|S_j) \\ &\leq \tau_{i-1}^{-} + f(u|S_j) \leq \tau_{j-1}^{-} + f(u|S_j) \leq \tau_j^{-} \leq \tau_n^{-}. \end{aligned} \tag{112}$$

The first inequality is due to $S_j = S_{j-1} \backslash u \cup v_j$ and Lemma 5, the second inequality is due to $S_i \subseteq S_{j-1}$ and submodularity, the third inequality is due to $f(v_i|S_i) \leq \tau^-_{i-1}$, the fourth inequality are due to the fact that τ^- is non-decreasing in Algorithm 2, the fifth inequality is due to A2.L8 and non-decreasing property of τ^-. By induction, we have $f(v_i|S_n) \leq \tau^-_n$. if no swapping happens, for each rejected element v_i, we directly have $f(v_i|S_n) \leq f(v_i|S_i) \leq \tau^-_{i-1} \leq \tau^-_n$ because of submodularity. Therefore, the first condition in (111) is true.

Secondly, assume $f(S_{i-1}) \geq |S_{i-1}|\tau^+_{i-1}$, if swapping happens in step i, according to ρ in A2.L6 and A2.L9, we have $f(S_i) \geq |S_i|(\tau^+_{i-1} + \rho) = |S_i|\tau^+_i$; if no swapping happens, we have $f(S_i) \geq |S_i|\tau^+_{i-1} = |S_i|\tau^+_i$ because $\tau^+_{i-1} = \tau^+_i$. By induction, we have $f(S_n) \geq |S_n|\tau^+_n$. Therefore, the second condition in (111) is true. This completes the proof. □

4.11 Extensions to Other Constraints

4.11.1 Knapsack Constraint

The problem is modified to

$$\max_{S \subseteq V} f(S) \;\; s.t. \;\; \sum_{v \in S} c(v) \leq b. \tag{113}$$

The following modification needs to be applied to Algorithm 1. The thresholding of $f(v|S)$ changes to thresholding of $f(v|S)/c(v)$, i.e., it adds v to S if $\frac{f(v|S)}{c(v)} \geq \tau^+$, removes v if $\frac{f(v|S)}{c(v)} \leq \tau^-$, and saves v in buffer B otherwise. Accordingly, A1.L9 in greedy stage is replaced by $v^* = \text{argmax}_{v \in B} f(v|S)/c(v)$. Then we can achieve the following bound analogous to Theorem 1.

Theorem 5. *After applying the above modification for knapsack constraint to Algorithm 1, the following holds for the output $\tilde{S}$ and is and the optimal set S^* of problem (113).*

$$f(\tilde{S}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left[\left(1 - e^{-\frac{b-\alpha}{b-\beta}}\right)\left(f(S^*) - \beta\tau^-\right) + e^{-\frac{b-\alpha}{b-\beta}}\alpha\tau^+\right], \tag{114}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= b - \textstyle\sum_{v \in S_+ \backslash S_n} c(v) \leq \sum_{v \in S_n} c(v) \\ \beta &= b - \textstyle\sum_{u \in S^* \cap B_n} c(u) = \sum_{u \in S^* \backslash (S_n \cup B_n)} c(u). \end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

Here $S_+ = S \cup v_+$ is the solution set S which firstly violates the knapsack constraint $\sum_{v \in S} c(v) \leq b$ because of adding v_+ in the final greedy stage of stream clipper.

It can be verified that the right hand side of (114) is larger than $(1/4)f(S^*)$.

Proof. By following the proof of greedy algorithm for submodular maximization with knapsack constraint, we study the solution $S_+ = S \cup v_+$ firstly violating the constraint $\sum_{v \in S} c(v) \leq b$ in the greedy stage. For the first step of the modified greedy algorithm,

$$\begin{aligned} & f(S^*) \\ & \leq f(S_n \cup S^*) \leq f(S_n) + \sum_{v \in S^* \backslash S_n} f(v|S_n) \\ & \leq f(S_n) + \sum_{v \in S^* \backslash (S_n \cup B_n)} c(v) \cdot \tfrac{f(v|S_n)}{c(v)} + \\ & \quad \sum_{v \in S^* \cap B_n} c(v) \cdot \tfrac{f(v|S_n)}{c(v)} \\ & \leq f(S_n) + \sum_{u \in S^* \backslash (S_n \cup B_n)} c(u) \cdot \tau^- + \\ & \quad \sum_{u \in S^* \cap B_n} c(u) \cdot \tfrac{f(S_{n+1}) - f(S_n)}{c(S_{n+1} \backslash S_n)} \\ & = f(S_n) + \beta\tau^- + \tfrac{b-\beta}{c(S_{n+1} \backslash S_n)} \left[f(S_{n+1}) - f(S_n)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

After rearranging,

$$[f(S^*) - \beta\tau^-] - f(S_n) = \frac{b - \beta}{c(S_{n+1} \backslash S_n)} \left[f(S_{n+1}) - f(S_n)\right] \tag{117}$$

Let

$$\delta_n = f(S^*) - \beta\tau^-, \tag{118}$$

then the rearranged inequality equals to

$$\delta_{n+1} \leq \left(1 - \frac{c(S_{n+1} \backslash S_n)}{b - \beta}\right) \delta_n, \tag{119}$$

It can be easily verified that the above inequality between δ_{n+1} and δ_n also holds for all δ_{i+1} and δ_i with $n \leq i \leq n + |S| - 1$. Repeatedly applying these inequalities yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{n+|S_+|-|S_n|} &\leq \prod_{i=n}^{|S_+|-1} \left(1 - \tfrac{c(S_{i+1} \backslash S_i)}{b-\beta}\right) \cdot \delta_n \\
&= \prod_{v \in S_+ \backslash S_n} \left(1 - \tfrac{c(v)}{b-\beta}\right) \cdot \delta_n \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{v \in S_+ \backslash S_n} c(v)}{(b-\beta)(|S_+|-|S_n|)}\right)^{|S_+|-|S_n|} \cdot \delta_n \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{b-\alpha}{(b-\beta)(|S_+|-|S_n|)}\right)^{|S_+|-|S_n|} \cdot \delta_n \\
&\leq e^{-\frac{b-\alpha}{b-\beta}} \delta_n.
\end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

The second inequality is due to AM-GM inequality (i.e., the inequality of arithmetic and geometric means). Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& f(S_+) \\
&\geq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{b-\alpha}{b-\beta}}\right) [f(S^*) - \beta\tau^-] + e^{-\frac{b-\alpha}{b-\beta}} f(S_n) \\
&\geq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{b-\alpha}{b-\beta}}\right) [f(S^*) - \beta\tau^-] + e^{-\frac{b-\alpha}{b-\beta}} \sum_{v \in S_n} c(v)\tau^+ \\
&\geq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{b-\alpha}{b-\beta}}\right) [f(S^*) - \beta\tau^-] + e^{-\frac{b-\alpha}{b-\beta}} \alpha\tau^+.
\end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

The second inequality in (121) is due to

$$f(S_n) \geq \sum_{v \in S_n} c(v)\tau^+, \tag{122}$$

and the last inequality in (121) is due to the first inequality in (115), which is resulted from

$$b \leq \sum_{v \in S_+} c(v) \leq \sum_{v \in S_+ \backslash S_n} c(v) + \sum_{v \in S_n} c(v). \tag{123}$$

According to the modified greedy algorithm for knapsack constraint, given

$$x^* = \operatorname*{argmax}_{v \in B_n} f(v), \tag{124}$$

we have

$$f(S) + f(x^*) \geq f(S_+). \tag{125}$$

Therefore, the output $\tilde{S} = \operatorname{argmax}\{f(S), f(x^*)\}$ satisfies

$$f(\tilde{S}) \geq \frac{1}{2} f(S_+). \tag{126}$$

Recall the lower bound of $f(S_+)$ given in (121), that completes the proof. □

4.11.2 Matroid Constraint

The problem is modified to

$$\max_{S \subseteq V} f(S) \;\; s.t. \;\; S \in \mathcal{I}, \tag{127}$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ is the set of independent sets.

The following modification needs to be applied to Algorithm 1. Extra condition $S \cup v_i \in \mathcal{I}$ is added to A1.L2. And A1.L10 is executed only when $S \cup v^* \in \mathcal{I}$.

Theorem 6. *After the above modification, Algorithm 1 outputs a solution S with approximation bound*

$$f(S) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left[f(S^*) - (k - k^{'} - |S_n|)\tau^{+}\right], \tag{128}$$

where S^* is the optimal set of problem (127), $k^{'} = |A| = |C|$ such that

$$\begin{array}{l} A = \{v \in S \backslash S_n : \phi^{-1}(v) \in S^* \cap B_n\}, \\ C = \{v \in S^* \cap B_n : \phi(v) \in S \backslash S_n\}. \end{array} \tag{129}$$

wherein $\phi : S^* \to S$ is the bijection whose existence has been guaranteed by the matroid property, and $\phi^{-1} : S \to S^*$ is its inverse.

Proof. Let $k_n = |S^* \backslash S_n \cup B_n|$, we have

$$\begin{array}{rl} & f(S^*) \\ \leq & f(S \cup S^*) \leq f(S) + \sum\limits_{v \in S^* \backslash S} f(v|S) \\ \leq & f(S) + \sum\limits_{v \in S^* \backslash (S_n \cup B_n)} f(v|S) + \sum\limits_{v \in S^* \cap B_n} f(v|S) \\ \leq & f(S) + k_n\tau^{-} + \sum\limits_{v \in C} f(v|S) + \sum\limits_{v \in (S^* \cap B_n) \backslash C} f(v|S) \\ \leq & [f(S) + \sum\limits_{v \in A} f(v|S)] + k_n\tau^{-} + (k - k_n - k^{'})\tau^{+} \\ \leq & 2f(S) - \sum\limits_{v \in S \backslash (S_n \cup A)} f(v|S) - \\ & \sum\limits_{v \in S_n} f(v|S) + k_n\tau^{-} + (k - k_n - k^{'})\tau^{+} \\ \leq & 2f(S) - \sum\limits_{v \in S \backslash (S_n \cup A)} f(v|S) - \\ & |S_n|\tau^{+} + k_n\tau^{-} + (k - k_n - k^{'})\tau^{+} \\ \leq & 2f(S) - |S_n|\tau^{+} + k_n\tau^{-} + (k - k_n - k^{'})\tau^{+} \\ = & 2f(S) - \left[(k^{'} + |S_n| - k)\tau^{+} + k_n(\tau^{+} - \tau^{-})\right] \\ \leq & 2f(S) - \left[(k^{'} + |S_n| - k)\tau^{+}\right]. \end{array} \tag{130}$$

The fifth inequality in (130) is due to $|(S^* \cap B_n) \backslash C| = k - k_n - k^{'}$, the sixth inequality uses the fact

$$f(S) = \sum_{v \in A} f(v|S) + \sum_{v \in S \backslash (S_n \cup A)} f(v|S) + \sum_{v \in S_n} f(v|S), \tag{131}$$

the seventh inequality in (130) is a result of monotonicity, the eighth inequality in (130) is due to $\tau^{+} \geq \tau^{-}$.

By rearranging (130), we have

$$f(S) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left[f(S^*) - (k - k^{'} - |S_n|)\tau^{+}\right]. \tag{132}$$

This completes the proof. □

4.12 Supplemental Experiments

4.13 Experiments on DUC2001 News Summarization

We also observe similar result on DUC 2001 corpus, which are composed of two datasets. The first one includes 60 sets of documents, each is selected by a NIST assessor because the documents in a set are related to a same topic. The assessor also provides four human generated summary of word count $400, 200, 100, 50$ for each set. In Figure9 and Figure10, we report the statistics to rouge-2 and F1-score of summaries of the same size generated by different algorithms. The second dataset is composed of four document sets associated with four topics. We report the detailed results in Table 1. Both of them show stream clipper can achieve similar performance as offline greedy algorithm, whereas outperforms sieve-streaming.



Figure 9: Statistics of relative utility $f(S)/f(S_{greedy})$, rough-2 score and F1-score on topic based news summarization results of 60 document sets from DUC2001 training and test set, comparing to 400-word human generated summary.

Table 1: Performance of Lazy greed, sieve-streaming, and stream clipper on four topic summarization datasets from DUC 2001. For each topic, the machine generated summary is compared to four human generated ones of word count from 50 to 400.

Algorithm	words	Daycare		Healthcare		Pres92		Robert Gates	
		rouge2	F1	rouge2	F1	rouge2	F1	rouge2	F1
Lazy Greedy	400	0.836	0.674	0.845	0.686	0.885	0.686	0.849	0.734
	200	0.813	0.615	0.811	0.632	0.842	0.623	0.788	0.682
	100	0.766	0.542	0.753	0.605	0.618	0.420	0.715	0.621
	50	0.674	0.484	0.765	0.539	0.602	0.341	0.631	0.514
Sieve-Streaming	400	0.825	0.687	0.814	0.711	0.827	0.710	0.798	0.745
	200	0.789	0.627	0.782	0.675	0.670	0.659	0.691	0.688
	100	0.747	0.542	0.658	0.597	0.414	0.443	0.632	0.620
	50	0.607	0.475	0.681	0.551	0.413	0.345	0.553	0.477
Stream Clipper	400	0.841	0.724	0.838	0.763	0.859	0.746	0.834	0.754
	200	0.803	0.693	0.807	0.706	0.810	0.654	0.764	0.690
	100	0.763	0.613	0.778	0.670	0.581	0.445	0.732	0.621
	50	0.689	0.489	0.794	0.592	0.463	0.378	0.628	0.569



Figure 10: Statistics of relative utility $f(S)/f(S_{greedy})$, rough-2 score and F1-score on topic based news summarization results of 60 document sets from DUC2001 training and test set, comparing to 200-word human generated summary.

4.13.1 Video Summarization

We apply lazy greedy, sieve-streaming, and stream clipper to 25 videos from video summarization dataset SumMe [9][3]. Each video has $1000 \sim 10000$ frames as given in Table 2 [1]. We resize each frame to a 180×360 image, and extract features from two standard image descriptors, i.e., a pyramid of HoG (pHoG) [4] to delineate local and global shape, and GIST [17] to capture global scene. The 2728 pHoG features are achieved over a four-level pyramid using 8 bins with angle of 360 degrees. The 256 GIST features are obtained by using 4×4 blocks and 8 orientation per scale. We concatenate them to form a 2984-dimensional feature vector for each frame to build $f(\cdot)$. Each algorithm selects 15% of all frames as summary set, i.e., $k = 0.15|V|$. Sieve-streaming holds a memory of $10k$ frames, while stream clipper uses a much smaller memory of $300 + k$ frames.

We compare the summaries generated by the three algorithms with the ones produced by the ground truth and 15 users. Each user was asked to select a subset of frames as summary, and ground truth score of each frame is given by voting from all 15 users. For each video, we compare each algorithm generated summary with the reference summary composed of the top p frames with the largest ground truth scores for different p, and the user summary from different users. In particular, we report F1-score and recall for comparison to ground truth score generated summaries in Figure 11 and Figure 12. We report F1-score and recall for comparison to user summaries in Figure 13 and Figure 14. In each plot for each video, we also report the average F1-score and average recall over all 15 users.

Stream clipper approaches or outperforms lazy greedy and shows high F1-score on most videos, while the time cost is small according to Table 2. Although on a few videos sieve-streaming achieves

[3] http://www.vision.ee.ethz.ch/~gyglim/vsum/



Figure 11: F1-score of the summaries generated by lazy greedy ("●"), sieve-streaming ("×"), stream clipper ("♦") and the first 15% frames ("·") comparing to reference summaries of different sizes between $[0.02|V|, 0.32|V|]$ based on ground truth score (voting from 15 users) on 25 videos from SumMe. Each plot associates with a video.

the best F1-score, in these cases its generated summaries are trivially dominated by the first 15% frames as shown in Figure 11-14.



Figure 12: Recall of the summaries generated by lazy greedy ("●"), sieve-streaming ("×"), stream clipper ("♦") and the first 15% frames ("·") comparing to reference summaries of different sizes between $[0.02|V|, 0.32|V|]$ based on ground truth score (voting from 15 users) on 25 videos from SumMe. Each plot associates with a video.



Figure 13: F1-score of the summaries generated by greedy (yellow bar), sieve-streaming (cyan bar), stream clipper (magenta bar) and the first 15% frames (green bar) comparing to reference summaries from 15 users on 25 videos from SumMe dataset. Each plot associates with a video.



Figure 14: Recall of the summaries generated by greedy (yellow bar), sieve-streaming (cyan bar), stream clipper (magenta bar) and the first 15% frames (green bar) comparing to reference summaries from 15 users on 25 videos from SumMe dataset. Each plot associates with a video.

Table 2: Information of SumMe dataset and time cost (CPU seconds) of different algorithms.

Videoname	#frames	Lazy Greedy	Sieve-streaming	Stream Clipper
Air Force One	4494	907.3712	3.9182	75.5463
Base jumping	4729	164.1434	5.5865	30.2570
Bearpark climbing	3341	177.8583	3.7311	34.2229
Bike polo	3064	96.5305	3.9578	24.7901
Bus in rock tunnel	5131	505.7766	6.0088	130.8577
Car over camera	4382	146.9416	5.3323	59.2436
Car railcrossing	5075	852.1686	5.2265	123.0835
Cockpit landing	9046	669.8063	12.3186	103.6095
Cooking	1286	30.0717	1.2868	4.9270
Eiffel tower	4971	304.2690	5.4755	81.4899
Excavators river crossing	9721	1507.3028	13.8139	283.7986
Fire Domino	1612	34.2871	1.8814	9.4465
Jumps	950	15.0508	0.9055	5.1711
Kids playing in leaves	3187	221.4644	3.4660	37.7304
Notre Dame	4608	169.1235	5.1406	69.4589
Paintball	6096	763.3255	6.7853	114.3241
Paluma jump	2574	210.8670	2.5342	25.5281
Playing ball	3120	132.7437	3.2250	14.0948
Playing on water slide	3065	111.7358	3.4088	30.9812
Saving dolphines	6683	435.0732	7.3322	78.4372
Scuba	2221	45.6177	2.5213	8.3734
St Maarten Landing	1751	19.0717	2.8701	3.5580
Statue of Liberty	3863	160.7075	4.0164	56.4238
Uncut evening flight	9672	718.7015	14.6717	122.7112
Valparaiso downhill	5178	428.3941	6.0002	70.6994